

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2, 3, and 5-19 are pending in the application.

By the foregoing Amendment, claims 8 and 10 are sought to be rewritten in independent form to incorporate the limitations of claim 11, and 12-14 are sought to be amended to depend from claim 10, instead of claim 11. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 11 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 20-22, which recite the same limitations as claims 12-14, but which depend from claim 8, are sought to be added.

These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

### **Substance of the Interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on May 4, 2005. The substance of this interview is discussed below under "Allowable Subject Matter."

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's indication that claims 15-19 are allowed, and that claims 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under section 112, second paragraph set forth in the Office Action, and if rewritten in independent form.

The Office Action does not set forth any rejections under section 112. This was pointed out to the Examiner in a telephonic interview on May 4, 2005. The Examiner advised that the mention of rejections under section 112 was in error, and that claims 8-10 should merely be objected to as being dependent upon rejected claims and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, claims 8 and 10 are amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 11, from which they depend, and are therefore now believed to be allowable. Claims 12-14, as amended to depend from claim 10, and new claims 20-22, which recite the same limitations as claims 12-14, but which depend from claim 8, are also now believed to be allowable.

#### Objection to the Claims

As indicated in the telephonic conference of May 4, 2005, claims 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This objection is believed to be overcome by the proposed amendments to claims 8 and 10, as discussed above.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 11-14 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watchorn or Ishii or Hebant or Canadian document CA 967770 or British document GB 2355750 or Japanese documents JP 7-42469, JP 08082186 or JP 2001-3363 in view of Kandle. The rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 11 is overcome by their proposed cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection of claims 12-14 is overcome by their proposed amendment to depend from amended claim 10.

Entry of Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116

Entry of the above amendments with respect to claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 11-14 is believed in order under section 116 inasmuch as they consist of canceling claims or complying with requirements of form expressly set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

Entry of the above amendments with respect to the addition of claims 20-22 is believed in order under section 116, inasmuch as they do not touch on the merits, those claims reciting the same limitations as previously-examined claims 12-14 and depending from an allowable claim.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections have been complied with, properly traversed, or rendered moot. Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: 6/17/05

By: 

**Customer No. 00,136**  
400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 638-6666

Allen S. Melser  
Registration No. 27,215